



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Book Reviews.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark.
[International Critical Commentary Series.] By EZRA P. GOULD, S.T.D.,
Professor of the New Testament Literature and Language, Divinity
School of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Philadelphia. New York :
Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1896. Pp. lviii, 317. Price, \$3.00.

In the matter of thorough, scholarly, up-to-date commentaries the gospels are the most neglected portion of the New Testament. Germany has the works of Holtzmann, Weiss and Weiss-Meyer upon some or all of the gospels, which somewhat supply their lack ; but England and America are struggling along with no first-class modern commentaries upon the gospels. The best we have is an old translation of Meyer's on the four gospels, and of Godet's on Luke and John, with Broadus's on Matthew and Morison's on Matthew and Mark, all out of date or of but secondary value ; and a host of small commentaries good enough in their way, but entirely inadequate and without the basis of a thorough, up-to-date criticism of the gospels. This unfortunate condition of things is due to the fact that the whole problem of the origin of the four gospels and their relation to each other has been undergoing reconsideration in the light of modern historical methods and knowledge, and the reconstructed view has not been up to this time fully agreed upon. Perhaps it is yet too early to say with certainty what the reconstructed view will be, though there seems to be sufficient agreement with reference to the most important features of the problem. We therefore have reason to think that the great lack can be in a few years supplied.

The editors and aims of the International Critical Commentary series, and the three volumes of the series which have already appeared, have awakened the expectation that the commentaries upon the gospels therewith announced will meet our need. The volume upon Mark has just been published, that upon Luke by Dr. Plummer is in the press ; those upon Matthew and John have not yet been assigned. There is opportunity for making them the two greatest and most influential books on the Bible for a generation ; that they may realize their possibilities is devoutly to be wished.

The Gospel of Mark, while in comparison of less importance than Matthew or John, nevertheless presents a great opportunity for the commentator. Dr. Gould has in a large measure seen and fulfilled this opportunity. He has undoubtedly given us a commentary on Mark which surpasses all others, a thing which we have reason to expect will be true in the case of every volume of the series to which it belongs.

The introduction contains a brief discussion of the synoptic problem, of the characteristics of Mark, and an analysis of events; a statement of the person and principles of Jesus in Mark; a discussion of the gospels in the second century; a review of recent literature, and a statement of the sources of the text. The synoptic (Dr. Gould prefers the longer form "synoptical") gospels are regarded as showing both interdependence and independence. In general, their contents and arrangement are the same. This similarity is to be explained as the effect of oral tradition, which must have been in Aramaic. But the verbal resemblances between the gospels cannot have been due to oral tradition, because oral tradition does not tend to fix language to the extent which here appears, and because verbal resemblances disappear in translation, so that the verbal resemblances of the Greek gospels must be the result of dependence of the written accounts upon each other. One would wish to ask at this point for the evidence that the oral tradition was in Aramaic *only*; some of it was, in Judea, as the *Logia* were in that language, and as it would naturally tend to stay in the language in which it was given. But for the benefit and use of Hellenistic Christians, and even of Gentile Christians, some of whom came into the church before the period of oral tradition passed, there would be likely to be an oral tradition in Greek, to which would be due a portion of the verbal agreements and variations which are present in the gospels. The author regards it as sufficiently settled that there are two original sources of the synoptics, one of which is the translation into Greek of Matthew's *Logia* (not our present first gospel), containing discourses of Christ, and the other our present Gospel of Mark. Mark prepared his gospel from the memorabilia of Peter, plus some material from the *Logia*. His aim is to present only the active public life of Jesus so that the gospel seems curtailed when it closes (at verse 8) without a record of the resurrection appearances of Christ, but that was the way in which Mark left it. The present close of the gospel (verses 9-20) was attached at a later time to round out the work. The detailed and vivid descriptions which characterize this gospel come from Peter as the source of the Mark material. From the eschatological discourse it would appear that the date of the gospel was about 70 A.D., before the destruction of Jerusalem.

With reference to the gospels in the second century, after an excellent discussion of the subject, Dr. Gould concludes (1) that the second century literature certainly uses extra-canonical sources of information about our Lord, and does it freely and without apology; (2) that the four gospels were the main stream to which the rest was tributary,—the standard writings on the subject; (3) that they were not Scripture in the sense which we attach to that word,—they were not separated from other writings by any such line; (4) that the amount and importance of extra-canonical matter is after all small. Substantially, the Jesus of the second century literature is the Jesus of the gospels. These conclusions we believe to be in accordance with the facts.

The recent critical literature upon Mark which has received the writer's attention are the works of Meyer to whom he gives first place ; of Weiss, whom he wisely criticises in some particulars ; of Beyschlag, whose *Leben Jesu* he highly commends ; of Holtzmann, whose one blemish is the repudiation of the miraculous, and whose views in this respect are repeatedly controverted throughout the commentary, and briefly, of Orello Cone and James Morison. These are the scholars whose researches and opinions are the foundation of Dr. Gould's work, to which he has added not a little that is his own. The grammatical authorities to which he constantly refers are Thayer's *Lexicon*, Winer's *Grammar* and Burton's *Moods and Tenses*. It is singular that Buttmann's *Grammar* is never mentioned, nor Cremer's *Lexicon*, nor Wendt's *Lehre Jesu* ; can the work have been prepared without any reference to them ? The text used is an independent one, but is substantially that of Westcott and Hort and Tischendorf's Eighth.

The commentary proper is carried out in the admirable way planned by the editors of the series. The condensed paraphrases which stand at the head of the sections have been prepared with great care and skill, and deserve special commendation. The paragraphs of explanation of the history and the interrelations of the sections of material are lucid and informing, and the comments upon words and phrases, verse by verse, are in the main highly satisfactory. There is very little reference to varying opinions of interpretation ; the view of the author is presented as concisely and explicitly as possible. Archæological notes appear from time to time, but a strange omission is the absence of any remark as to the location of Golgotha. The notes of textual criticism which, in small type, follow the comment upon each verse, are very useful ; it is certainly the best possible arrangement for this material. The footnotes pertain mostly to the linguistic features of the material, and add greatly to the value of the work. Then, finally, there are special topics which receive here and there extended treatment. The orderly system according to which are grouped these several elements which go to make up a perfect commentary marks a distinct advance upon previous works of this sort, and increases greatly the service which the book can render.

Space hardly permits a review of Dr. Gould's interpretation of individual difficult passages. Generally he has given the interpretation which the latest and best study of the gospels presents ; but sometimes one is disappointed. He has not taken sufficient note of the parallel readings in the other gospels which differ from Mark, *e. g.*, Mark 1 : 38 = Luke 4 : 43 (p. 29). No mention is made of the different Johannine position of the cleansing of the temple. The parallelism of amount between Judas' thirty shekels and those of Ex. 21 : 32 and Zech. 11 : 12 he remarks as "curious" (p. 260), but this does not lead to any suggested explanation of the coincidence. In speaking of the Last Supper he says (p. 265) : "the gospels do not give us any command for the repetition of the supper, nor for its continuance as a church institution," a

statement which called for further comment. In Mark 14 : 41 (p. 271) he translates "sleep on now, and rest," without considering the recently strongly advocated reading "so then sleep on and rest." In speaking of the trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrin (Dr. Gould prefers *Sanhedrim*), he says (p. 283): "It is evident that their formal procedure had been the night before . . . this morning meeting was an informal gathering to decide on a plan of action before Pilate . . . This is the reverse of Jewish legal process." Is it likely that the Jewish legal process would have been reversed in this case? At Mark 15 : 11, when the multitude is stirred up to cry for Barabbas as against Jesus, the author says (p. 286): "This was the first time in the life of Jesus that the people had turned against him." A statement quite clearly wrong, for while Mark does not as explicitly as John (ch. 6) indicate the defection of the Galileans from Jesus, it is manifest from Mark, chs. 7, 8, 9, that Jesus had found it impossible to work longer in Galilee, and was journeying north and east in retirement, so that the popular crisis which John records would appear historical. At Mark 15 : 34 he would read, not "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" but "why hast thou left me helpless?" which "interpreted in the spirit of the original, of the withholding of the divine help, so that his enemies had their will of him, it falls in with the prayer in Gethsemane;" an interpretation which, if true to the meaning of the Aramaic word, would be welcome.

The topical discussions, also, can only be touched upon. The miracles of the gospels are defended individually and at length (pp. 34, 86, 99, 119, 122, 149-151). The title "Son of God" is regarded as Messianic, but with an official not a metaphysical sense (pp. 3, 4, 12, 56). The title "Son of Man" was Messianic, but Jesus chose it to express and emphasize his brotherhood with man. Demoniactal possession he is inclined to regard as an unscientific explanation of common phenomena (pp. 23, 92). The records of Jesus' predictions as to his death and resurrection have been given a definiteness, in view of the event, which they did not at all have when first given, else the disciples would not have stumbled so at the crucifixion and wondered so at the resurrection (pp. 153, 197). Jesus did not present himself explicitly as the Messiah to the apostles until the transfiguration period, and not publicly until the triumphal entry (xxix., 50, 205, 209). In the eschatological discourse the view is taken (pp. 240-253, *cf.* p. 159) that the coming of the Son of Man predicted in the second part of the discourse did take place within that generation, in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem; that the apocalyptic accompaniments are to be understood as entirely figurative; and that the definite inauguration of the universal kingdom took place at that coming. One infers that the author thinks of no coming of the Son of Man other than, or at least different from, that one in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem. Upon the discussion of these points it is not possible here to enter.

The volume has good indices. A number of errors of typography and

some defects of style have been noted. The worst feature of the book, artistically considered, is that the paper on which it is printed is blotting-paper, on which it is impossible to use ink for making marginal notes. We must express regret, too, that the author did not avail himself of one hundred more pages of space, which would only then have brought his volume up to the size of Sanday's *Romans*, and would have made the work vastly better. There was great opportunity for a more detailed introduction, and for much more material in the commentary proper.

But Dr. Gould's *Commentary on Mark* is a large success, worthy to stand in the series to which it belongs, and a credit to American scholarship. It does not supersede other commentaries upon Mark for the reason that it is in no sense a thesaurus of investigation, interpretation and opinion with reference to the gospel. But it will be much more useful than any other single commentary on the book.

C. W. V.

The Critical Handbook of the Greek New Testament. By EDWARD C. MITCHELL, D.D. New and enlarged edition. New York, Harper & Bros. 1896, pp. 13 + 270. Price \$2.50.

The first edition of this work was published at Andover about fifteen years ago. The present edition though retaining the general plan of the former one has been so much enlarged as to constitute practically a new work. Part I is entitled Authenticity of the New Testament Scriptures; Part II, History of the Canon of the New Testament; Part III, History of the Text of the New Testament, while an appendix occupying ten pages more than the body of the book, contains thirteen valuable charts and tables.

Part I conveys in its 64 pages much valuable information clearly stated so far as the individual items are concerned. Its value, however, is much diminished by an apparent uncertainty on the writer's part as to the purpose which it was to serve. The variously used term authenticity is not defined, and the author seems himself to waver in his understanding of the now advancing evidence of the early origin of New Testament Scriptures, which would tend to prove the genuineness of the books now endeavoring to prove the early origin of Christianity, and thus apparently to show that the record is authentic. Much of the evidence might, of course, be used for either purpose, but the relation of the two themes is nowhere clearly stated. The treatment of the History of the Canon is very brief, occupying but 12 pages.

Part III occupying but 40 pages is necessarily a very condensed discussion of its subject, but is clear and informing. Its title, however, is hardly correct. It deals rather with the material for textual criticism of the New Testament and the method of such criticism than with the history of the text.

The Tables and Diagrams which constitute the second part of the volume will be very useful to the careful student of the Greek New Testament, chiefly indeed to a scholar, who no longer needs the body of the book, yet in some